



MEETING OF THE  
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN  
TAM

THURSDAY, April 26, 2007  
7:00 PM

ROOM 330  
MARIN COUNTY CIVIC CENTER  
3501 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE  
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Members Present:**

Steve Kinsey, Chair, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Al Boro, Vice Chair, City of San Rafael  
Judy Arnold, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Paul Albritton, Alternate, Sausalito City Council  
Peter Breen, San Anselmo City Council  
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council  
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council  
Carole Dillon-Knutson, Novato City Council  
Joan Lundstrom, Larkspur City Council  
Mary Ann Maggiore, Fairfax Town Council  
Michael Skall, Ross Town Council

**Members Absent:**

Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Charles McGlashan, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Thomas Cromwell, Belvedere City Council  
Amy Belser, Sausalito City Council  
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council

**Staff Members Present:**

Dianne Steinhäuser, TAM Executive Director  
David Chan, TAM Programming Manager  
Tho Do, Marin DPW Associate Civil Engineer  
Li Zhang, TAM Finance Manager  
Jessica Woods, TAM Recording Secretary

*Chair Kinsey called the Transportation Authority of Marin Meeting to order at 7:12 p.m.*

**1. Chair Reports**

**a. Cynthia Murray and Paul Cohen commendations**

Chair Kinsey recognized Cynthia Murray and Paul Cohen for their efforts in securing funding for the North Bay Corridor along with staff and Sonoma County. He thanked both Cynthia Murray and Paul Cohen on behalf of TAM for stepping forward and helping them on something that will help their communities for a long time. He then provided both commendations recognizing each of them for their continued support and that TAM has resolved to honor them and their contribution. Cynthia Murray and Paul Cohen thanked TAM.

Chair Kinsey then thanked Commissioners Breen, Maggiore, Fredericks and staff for participating in a tour of the progress being made on the Gap Closure. TAM staff, in conjunction with Caltrans, will offer

additional opportunities for a site visit. They will use the existing 580 connector during construction of the new one that will save time and money.

Chair Kinsey also mentioned that, in the past week, MTC approved expenditures in the RM2 Program, which is the third dollar collected on the State owned bridges, including the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. The funds collected under this Program provided \$35 million for the SMART program and \$65 million for the Greenbrae multi-modal project and provided funding for support of public transit and inter-county bus service. He was pleased to approve about \$2.1 million for Golden Gate to continue Richmond Bridge service to BART and El Cerrito, which included Route 72 and Route 75, express bus services during peak hours. Chair Kinsey also mentioned that the Board of Supervisors approved the list of projects for the Non-motorized Transportation Pilot Project (NTPP) program. The county will fund \$20 million in projects to be completed in the next two years. He thanked the subcommittee for their effort and consideration. He pointed out that getting the money authorized is merely the beginning; but the goal is complete the projects and encouraged a collaborative effort with the Public Works Departments. He thanked the bicycle community who, years ago, recognized the importance of this process. The controversial project was the Alto Tunnel. It was agreed to study how to get from Mill Valley to Corte Madera and to review all possible routes including the tunnel. He finalized his report by noting that TAM will be holding a public workshop on Saturday, May 5. He strongly encouraged those in attendance to think about what should be done in Marin that they are not necessarily doing at this time such as programs, concerns, and investments. The first part of the day will address at what is currently being done as well as what more can be done to make transportation move forward in this County.

## **2. Commissioner Matters not on the Agenda - None**

## **3. Executive Director's Report**

ED Steinhauser provided TAM with an Executive Director's Report for their review that included the following:

- Federal
  - Congress decided to issue no federal earmarks in 2006-07, but will return to the federal budget 2007-08.
  - National Surface Transportation Program's Revenue Commission continues to explore future revenue on the national level. Early prognosis is that the National Highway Trust Fund will be in deficit next year, making re-authorization of the National Transportation Act, SAFETEA-LU more challenging.
- State
  - Budget
  - Legislation
    - AB 244 Vehicle Registration Fee
    - State Local Transportation Partnership Program
    - AB 32 Status Update
      - Environmental Justice Committee
      - Economic and Technology Advancement Advisory
      - Market Advisory Committee
      - Proposition 35 Decision
- Regional/Local
  - TAM Board Workshop
  - Highway 101, Marin Sonoma Narrows & Hwy 580/101 Connector Widening
  - Highway 101 Tour

- Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Updates
- TAC and COC openings

Bill Gamlen, Project Delivery Manager, discussed delivery statuses of the two CMIA projects: 1) 580/101 connector and 2) Marin Sonoma Narrows (MSN). He noted that both projects are moving forward. The 580/101 project received \$20 million in CMIA funds. This project has three key elements: 1) add the second connector lane to highway 580, 2) extend westbound Bellam off ramp, and 3) explore bike/pedestrian improvements in this area. The project is estimated at \$20 million and the project is fully funded. Detailed-design efforts are scheduled to commence in July 2007 and complete in June 2008. Construction is scheduled to start in January 2009. Staff is considering taking the lead on the detailed design efforts. TAM is coordinating with the City of San Rafael on bicycle and pedestrian improvements. A RFP may be issued next two months. Staff will develop a cooperative agreement with Caltrans for project delivery. Bill Gamlen noted that the MSN project is much more complicated and has many funding sources. The project received \$82.4 million in CMIA funds. The project scope is to improve safety in Segment B and relieve congestion in Segment A. The environmental document phase is scheduled to be released in June with a 60-day comment period that should be completed in June/July 2008. Advertisement for bids will be issued in September 2010 and construction will start early 2011. The work will be split between Marin and Sonoma counties. Staff is developing a cooperative agreement and an RFP for detailed design work.

Vice Chair Boro asked staff to discuss possible sidewalks and bicycle improvements on Francisco Blvd. ED Steinhauser responded that the scope of the project includes bicycle and pedestrian improvements through Bellam, recognizing that there are numerous complaints about complicated crossings, ramps and high-speed turns. She noted that improvements to East Francisco Blvd. are being coordinated with the 580/101 effort, including widening sidewalks and implementing bike improvements. The constraints are the right-of-ways near the businesses and where the freeway barrier must be located. Staff will continue to coordinate and work out the details as to how everything fits.

Chair Kinsey clarified with staff that funds for planning are available in the NTPP program for East Francisco Blvd. ED Steinhauser responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Breen pointed out that it will not be possible to build an entire HOV lane system through Segments A and B of the Narrows Project. He believed that a meeting of the subcommittee should be established on what could be done. ED Steinhauser noted that a fact sheet was provided that shows all the details for TAM's review.

Commissioner Arnold confirmed with staff that the report goes along with what the subcommittee discussed. ED Steinhauser responded in the affirmative.

Chair Kinsey noted that he was impressed with the focused effort between Caltrans, TAM and the contractor to save time and money on Segment 3 of the Gap Closure project. In regard to the construction start date of January 2009, he asked if it would be possible to take an early look to stage that project so that the piece that is meaningful would not have to wait for other parcels of the project. He said that this has occurred before where they celebrate the completion but the people are still waiting to use the facility. He wanted to stage the project so the serious backup will be addressed more quickly. Mr. Gamlen concurred.

The item was opened to public input.

Deb Hubsmith, MCBC, was grateful that bicycle/pedestrian improvements will occur on 580/101 connector. MCBC hoped that improvements on East Francisco project would move forward so that

bike/pedestrian improvements can be accommodated. She added that if \$20 million is not enough for the 580/101 Connector and the bike/pedestrian improvements, the Board will seek more funding. MCBC requested that the construction cost of the bicycle/pedestrian improvements to be included in the overall scope of work. In regard to the Narrows project, she had hoped to hear that bike/pedestrian improvements were a key integral part of that project. She added that state law requires that bike/pedestrian access be installed simultaneously. Her understanding from conversations that date back to 2001 was that the project would include a system of discontinuous frontage roads with Class 2 Bike Lanes and Class 1 separated pathways. As this project moves forward, it will be critically important to make sure the bike/pedestrian elements are scoped, designed and budgeted as an integral part of the project. Also, she requested that the one page fact sheet be revised so that the system of bike/pedestrian pathways will be part of the project.

ED Steinhauser responded that frontages include a system of Class 2 bicycle/pedestrian facilities. She added that they are not building all of the frontage road system and that there is a major portion north where the highway crosses the creek and floods, so a temporary bike system is not known yet and they must see if they have the funding. Until that next piece is funded, they cannot guarantee that all 8-1/2 miles can be built. But where frontages roads are being built, bike and pedestrian paths will be included.

Karen Nygren, Marin resident, asked for an explanation on the timing and procedure about the selection of the frontages and intersections in this project. She noted that previous meetings presented several options and designs. She was concerned that conversations were moving forward without knowing which alternative was selected. Chair Kinsey responded that the environmental document has not been released, so an alternative has not been selected. Mr. Gamlen agreed, adding that discussions, at this time, centered on phasing. Ms. Nygren said she believes that cost would be a factor in regard to which alternative is selected.

The public input was closed.

#### **4. Commissioner Report**

##### **a. Executive Committee**

Chair Kinsey noted that the Executive Committee minutes are included in the packet. He commented that the Executive Committee discussed bike/pedestrian issues, reviewed the financial reports that are presented tonight and discussed the office rents as well.

##### **b. Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Groups**

Chair Kinsey noted that the next meeting is scheduled for May 16<sup>th</sup>. He wanted to make sure all interested parties understand the proposition and some interim procedures before revising the request for monies.

##### **c. SMART**

Commissioner Breen reported that a subcommittee of the Board was chosen and is comprised of Chairman Mike Kerns, Vice Chairman McGlashan and Directors Boro, Jehn, and Riley. The subcommittee held six meetings from January 17 to April 18 to take testimony and receive feedback from about 50 different representatives in both counties. The Board used the information and developed a report and recommendations that were adopted by the Board last week as follows:

1. Direct staff to prepare the appropriate documents for future Board approval authorizing a ¼ cent sales tax measure for the November 2008 election ballot.
2. Direct staff to analyze and explore the possibility of:
  - a. Adding weekend night service to the propose project
  - b. Relocating the Novato South Station placement
  - c. Increasing the funding for the bicycle/pedestrian pathway from 57% to between 70% and 75% of the total pathway costs.
3. Director staff to revise SMART's Public Information Path to:
  - i. Provide Information to the Public Jurisdictions in the areas of:
    - a. Paving the tracks
    - b. Monorail, light rail, BART, new untested technologies
    - c. Decline of San Francisco bound commuters
    - d. Dual mode vehicle technology
    - e. Larkspur Station transfers
    - f. Downtown San Rafael street operation
    - g. Quiet zones
    - h. Freight issues
    - i. Greenway
  - ii. Prepare brief, easy to understand "white papers" on SMART-related issues:
    - a. Two way single track operation (including freight operations)
    - b. Alternative mode comparisons including cost comparison (heavy rail, light rail, monorail, new technologies)
    - c. Paving the tracks
    - d. Shuttle and bus connections
    - e. Park-n-Ride
    - f. Bio-diesel fuel impacts
    - g. Air quality impacts
    - h. Station planning

Commissioner Breen noted that two suggestions were added and adopted by the Board. One was cutting the weeds to let people know the location of the tracks and the other was the possibility of demonstrating the actual rolling stock that might be used in SMART operation. The Board adopted these suggestions and looks forward to various reports that will be forthcoming in the next several months. On the April 18 the subcommittee did meet with Larkspur representatives. They raised questions that were added to the list that included:

- What is the goal of SMART?
- How will a single track operation work?
- Will SMART be built from Cloverdale to Larkspur in one phase?
- How many people will switch to SMART?
- How does the pedestrian and bike connection work between the station and the ferry?
- Will SMART use eminent domain?
- How will the tunnel operate?
- Who will be responsible for maintenance of the tunnel?
- How will SMART effect the ABAG Regional Housing allocations?

Also, the City of Larkspur felt that communications between SMART and Larkspur could and should be improved. Larkspur suggested that SMART provide a fact sheet with current information on the project

and Larkspur station. Larkspur noted that SMART needs to recognize that significant constraints exist around the Larkspur Station site. The City officials asked that these questions be responded to in writing and asked that SMART representatives attend the public meeting with City Council scheduled sometime prior to July 2007. Those were added to the list and will be worked on as staff and subcommittee moves forward. The suggestion of the Board is if there are any other suggestions of individuals or communities believe that SMART should be looking at, they would appreciate hearing about those to be included in their work plan.

Commissioner Lundstrom noted, for the record, that Larkspur had a difficult time at this meeting because they found out that the report had already been written to the Board, taking into account 30 or 40 other people that had already been given questions and they received the questions just a few days before the meeting. So they wanted to emphasize that communication is very important and they wanted to be part of the dialogue and feedback. There is no public egress proposed from the Larkspur station to the nearest road, possibly requiring eminent domain action. These people wanted to provide input, particularly if the Larkspur Station takes away existing parking. The ferry is running full and the parking lot is usually full by 10:10 a.m. Since there is no excess capacity, overflow parking impacts the commercial and business center. They wanted to emphasize that working together will be critical.

Commissioner Arnold reported that she and a committee from Novato met with the NCRA and NWP who will be the operators of freight. They will run freight very soon coming from Willits down to Highway 37 in Novato and then travel to Napa. They are hoping to receive the Sonoma garbage contracts. They will be in Novato having a public scoping session and providing an opportunity for Novato residents to air out issues. The main concern is the quiet zones in nine possible areas, which will be addressed at the meeting.

The item was opened to public input.

Karney Nygren, Marin resident, noted that it is important to be aware that the sales tax might extend from 20 years to 25 or 30 years. Also, she expressed that SMART is a great idea, but right now TAM must also think about what SMART can do to get Marin residents to ride rail northbound. She commented that SMART does very little for residents in Southern, West and East Marin. She elaborated that SMART deals primarily with movement in one direction. She does not want Marin residents to be overlooked.

Deb Hubsmith, MCBC, stated that MCBC strongly supported the SMART project in the 2006 election. MCBC is working with the Adhoc Committee and is very pleased to see an increase in recommended funding to support the bicycle/pedestrian pathway, which is a continuous facility that will be important to get people to the train stations. She added that it is her understanding that SMART will work with local jurisdictions to figure out how to receive 100% funding for the bicycle/pedestrian pathway with the understanding that some of the pathway goes to local cities and there would be some contribution from the local cities for routes on City streets. It will be important for SMART to show that this is a continuous corridor. She also noted that SMART funding will not pay for the pathway between Petaluma and Novato. She commented that the plan is counting on the Marin/Sonoma Narrows project to build that pathway, so as TAM moves forward working with Caltrans on that design, they must make sure that the continuous bicycle and pedestrian facility is built with no gaps. There is a partnership between local cities, SMART and the Marin/Sonoma Narrows project to get this pathway built.

The public input was closed.

## **5. Consent Calendar**

- a. Approval of TAM Minutes of March 22, 2007. Recommendation: Approve.

- b. Approval of TAM 2006 Annual Report. Recommendation: TAM Board approved the Draft TAM 2006 Annual Report and authorized staff to print and distribute the report to Marin residents.

Commissioner Maggiore submitted a few typos to staff in regard to the Annual Report for their consideration.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

**Commissioner Fredericks moved and Commissioner Dillon-Knutson seconded, to adopt the Consent Calendar as amended. Motion carried unanimously.**

## **6. Caltrans Report**

Jit Pandher, Caltrans representative, reported that Highway 1 is open and that there was a ribbon-cutting ceremony on March 28. In the next couple months, lane closures will only allow for one-way traffic on Highway 1. Motorists can expect delays during the daytime. Night work on the Blithedale ramp will continue through Wednesday. Work on Highway 101 that started in March will continue. The bid opening for the Puerto Suello Hill segment of the Gap Closure project is scheduled for May 30<sup>th</sup>. Tomorrow, the contractor will pour concrete at Central San Rafael. Work will start at 5:00 a.m. and hopefully complete by 5:00 p.m.

Chair Kinsey asked if there are any SHOPP projects planned for Marin County. Mr. Pandher said he will research the issue and agreed to report back at the next meeting.

ED Steinhauser announced that Mr. Pandher has been designated by Caltrans as the Project Manager of the Marin/Sonoma Narrows project.

## **7. Adoption of TAM Investment Policy**

Li Zhang, Finance Manager, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM adopt the TAM Investment Policy.

Jim Martling, TAM Financial Advisor, highlighted a few aspects of the investment policy for TAM's consideration.

Roy Given, Treasurer for the County of Marin, also serves as TAM's Portfolio Manager. He indicated that his office reviewed the investment policy and found no issues and believed the changes made are very good.

Vice Chair Boro asked if Mr. Martling has compared the performance of the County of Marin's Treasurer's Department with other comparable organizations. Mr. Martling responded in the negative. Vice-Chair Boro asked if it would serve TAM to consider hiring a portfolio manager. ED Steinhauser noted that TAM's interest in the County portfolio is between \$15 and \$20 million, which will go toward the Gap Closure project in the next 8 months. She added that the portfolio size will decrease significantly in the coming years when TAM begins allocating funds for major road projects.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion to accept the investment policy.

**Commissioner Arnold moved and Commissioner Lundstrom seconded, to adopt the TAM Investment Policy. Motion carried unanimously.**

**8. FY2007-08 Staff/Professional Support from County of Marin**

ED Steinhauser summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM authorize the TAM Board Chair to approve agreements with the County of Marin regarding Public Works staff support, Auditor-Controller staff support, and County Counsel legal services. The Draft TAM FY 2007-08 Budget will include costs for these essential services, to be presented to the TAM Board in May 2007.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

**Commissioner Breen moved and Commissioner Fredericks seconded, to authorize TAM Board Chair to approve agreements with the County of Marin regarding Public Works staff support, Auditor-Controller staff support, and County Counsel legal services. The Draft TAM FY 2007-08 Budget will include costs for these essential services, to be presented to the TAM Board in May 2007. Motion carried unanimously.**

**9. FY2006-07 Third Quarter Financial Review and Measure A Revenue Projection for FY2007-08 Budget Development**

Finance Manager Zhang summarized the staff report and seeks authorization to proceed with the recommended revenue estimate in establishing the budget, updating the Strategic Plan, and communicating available revenue to sponsors.

Chair Kinsey explained that these are for estimating purposes. ED Steinhauser concurred.

The item was opened to public input, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the public input was closed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

**Commissioner Arnold moved and Commissioner Lundstrom seconded, to authorize staff to proceed with the recommended revenue estimate in establishing the budget, updating the Strategic Plan, and communicating available revenue to sponsors. Motion carried unanimously.**

**10. MCTD FY2004/05 Performance Monitoring Report Draft**

Amy Van Doren, representing MCTD, summarized the staff report and provided information to TAM for their review. She estimated projected costs and revenues over that time period covered by the cooperative agreement between TAM and MCTD. Based on those estimates, MCTD made allocation requests and the monies were allocated per the agreement. The agreement required that existing service levels be maintained until a Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) was completed. The SRTP was initiated in March 2005 and was approved by MCTD's board in March 2006. A service plan was approved in May 2006 and implemented in September 2006. They implemented changes on rural service in July 2006 and made additional improvements since that time. Staff provided TAM with information describing what they did to maintain the existing service levels. An addendum to the report is included in the packet. Also, Ms. Van Doren noted that MCTD is responsible for school supplemental routes, which are afternoon only routes.

Ms. Van Doren then explained that MCTD had an 18-month agreement with Golden Gate Transit that began in November 2004. It had certain costs assigned for the first part of the contract and another costs for the following year. However, MCTD paid the average on a monthly basis, pending reconciliation that did not occur until this fall. In May 2006, MCTD initiated a five-year contract with Golden Gate Transit that represents a different level of cost and revenue. It is rather complicated to



represent in a way that other people can fully comprehend. When MCTD began, they obtained loans from the county to sustain operations. Also, TAM supported MCTD's service levels until Measure A revenues started to come in as projected.

ED Steinhauser received comments from Commissioner Swanson and comments internally from staff, so they will modify the report. Staff wanted to coordinate with TAM before finalized. The next report will include implementation of service changes that went into effect in September, which will be a strong indication on how the sales tax is working. Staff will provide more information in the future.

Commissioner Maggiore cited a newspaper report that took issue with certain routes under MCTD's jurisdiction. She asked staff about the length of time it takes to determine the financial viability of a given route. Ms. Van Doren responded that they wait at least one year after the service plan is implemented. They have a monthly monitoring report that she could provide to TAM for their review, if so desired. Also, the added routes referenced in the report are new shuttle routes and adjustments are in the process of being made.

The item was opened to public input, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the public input was closed.

## **11. Office Relocation**

ED Steinhauser summarized the staff report and recommended that: a) TAM concur that cohabitation of TAM, MCTD and SMART is acceptable; b) the location of the office in Central Marin County with quality transit and bike/pedestrian access is a priority; c) TAM staffing level of 14 is appropriate as a space target; and d) the total square-footage needs of three agencies combined are appropriately targeted at 9,000 to 10,000 SF.

Chair Kinsey stated that staff did an outstanding job presenting the rationale and demonstrating how it was developed. He felt it is very advantageous to create a co-location opportunity in order to share ideas and fellowship between agencies. The higher number is somewhat of a concern to him. He added that the case is made persuasively for what they should give staff as the target to shoot for and then allow staff to use judgment on the layout of the space and whether or not staff can hit the lower end of those ranges versus the higher end.

Commissioner Arnold supported staff looking at properties in Northern Marin as well as improving the transit options.

Commissioner Maggiore expressed concerns for allowing the location choice to hinge solely on price and reminded staff that transit and bike/pedestrian accessibility should also be decision factors. ED Steinhauser indicated that staff would provide a report to the Executive Committee on a number of issues to substantiate their location choice. Many staff members work into the late evening hours, so security must be considered. Also ADA improvements and tenant improvements are of concerns. Tenant improvements could cost more because older buildings require significant ADA upgrades. All factors will be considered and staff will come back with a list of properties to provide additional direction.

Commissioner Lundstrom concurred with the staff recommendation for Central Marin due to the close proximity to the Civic Center.

The item was opened to public input.

Karen Nygren, Marin resident, wondered how rental cost will be divided considering the scenario put forth by TAM staff includes a larger staff than what currently exists. Chair Kinsey confirmed that costs will be divided according to the scenario laid out by TAM's Executive Director. She asked that consideration be given to the SMART portion of the space in the event that the train proposition does not pass.

The public input was closed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

**Commissioner Breen moved and Commissioner Fredericks seconded to: a) TAM concur that cohabitation of TAM, MCTD and SMART is acceptable; b) the location of the office in Central Marin County with quality transit and bike/pedestrian access is a priority; c) TAM staffing level of 14 is appropriate as a space target; and d) the total square-footage needs of three agencies combined are appropriately targeted at 9,000 to 10,000 SF.**

*Commissioner Albritton excused himself from the TAM meeting at 9:07pm.*

## **12. Non-motorized Transportation Pilot Program City Subcommittee Report**

Commissioner Lundstrom reported that city representatives did participate in the early stages of review on criteria to the TAC and then later after public meetings had another recommendation and a final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors based on the Public Works recommendation. They concurred that including cities made it a stronger process with more balance. They acknowledged the difficult process that all went through. Not all were happy due to the many competing interests, but in the end it was a great process by incorporating the cities. Now, they must make this work and believed next they will go to all cities with a memorandum of understanding that they must agree to in order to help make it happen. This will be a great benefit to a number of people and believed Marin County should be proud. This is an extraordinary opportunity and she thanked everyone.

## **13. Hwy 101 Gap Closure Update**

Connie Preston, Vali Cooper & Associates, announced that the Segment 3 portion of the Gap Closure project is on schedule. Concrete for the 580/101-connector part is being poured tomorrow and at least one lane is expected to be completed and open in the fall. The entire project will be completed in December 2008. In regards to Puerto Suello Hill project, an open house is being planned for that project similar to Segment 3. They anticipate construction starting in July in addition to the groundbreaking ceremony.

Vice Chair Boro asked staff to clarify an earlier comment about contractors requesting that the bid opening be postponed due to the re-construction taking place at the maze. ED Steinhauser responded that staff must investigate further.

## **14. Open time for items not on the agenda**

Deb Hubsmith, MCBC, commented on the Measure A local infrastructure funds and explained that, as part of the Measure A legislation, all the local infrastructure projects are to consider the needs of bicyclists/pedestrians when roadway work or transit work is being done. MCBC sent a letter about five weeks ago to every Public Works Director in Marin County with a list of projects that they plan to implement for the 06/07 funding and they asked how they plan to incorporate the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians where feasible. However, she received no responses yet. She will send TAM a letter

asking them to follow up with their City Managers and Public Works Directors. Additionally, she announced that Thursday, May 17<sup>th</sup> is Bike-to-Work Day and she encouraged all to participate.

Karen Nygren, Marin resident, referred to the workshop on May 5<sup>th</sup> and suggested adding information to the IJ in order to receive more public response. ED Steinhauser indicated that it has been done.

Commissioner Maggiore announced that she will be unable to attend the May 5<sup>th</sup> workshop, but the Mayor of Fairfax will attend. She wanted to develop ideas where major corporations actively participate in reducing congestion.

*By Order of Chair Kinsey, the TAM meeting adjourned at 9:19pm.*